



Imake

28/8

\$

PTO/SB/21 (08-00)

TRANSMITTAL FORM (to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)	Application Number	10/074,050	
	Filing Date	February 14, 2002	
	First Named Inventor	Shunpei YAMAZAKI et al.	
	Group Art Unit	2818	
	Examiner Name	D. Le	
Total Number of Pages in This Submission		Attorney Docket Number	0756-2434

ENCLOSURES (check all that apply)

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fee Transmittal Form <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fee Attached <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Amendment / Reply <input type="checkbox"/> After Final <input type="checkbox"/> Affidavits/declaration(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Extension of Time Request <input type="checkbox"/> Express Abandonment Request <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement <input type="checkbox"/> Certified Copy of Priority Document(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Response to Missing Parts/Incomplete Application <input type="checkbox"/> Response to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53	<input type="checkbox"/> Assignment Papers (for an Application) <input type="checkbox"/> Drawing(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Declaration and Power of Attorney <input type="checkbox"/> Licensing-related Papers <input type="checkbox"/> Petition <input type="checkbox"/> Petition to Convert to a Provisional Application <input type="checkbox"/> Power of Attorney, Revocation Change of Correspondence Address <input type="checkbox"/> Terminal Disclaimer <input type="checkbox"/> Request for Refund <input type="checkbox"/> CD, Number of CD(s) _____	<input type="checkbox"/> After Allowance Communication to Group <input type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences <input type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to Group (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief) <input type="checkbox"/> Proprietary Information <input type="checkbox"/> Status Letter <input type="checkbox"/> Other Enclosures 1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6.
Remarks <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees required or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 50-2280 for the above identified docket number.		

SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT

Firm or Individual name	Eric J. Robinson, Reg. No. 38,285 Robinson Intellectual Property Law Office, P.C. PMB 955 21010 Southbank Street Potomac Falls, VA 20165
Signature	
Date	March 1, 2004

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date indicated below.			
Type or printed name			
Signature		Date	March 1, 2004

Burden Hour Statement: This form is estimated to take 0.2 hours to complete. Time will vary depending upon the needs of the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you are required to complete this form should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, Washington, DC 20231. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, Washington, DC 20231.

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Patent Application of:

Shunpei YAMAZAKI et al.

Serial No. 10/074,050

Filed: February 14, 2002

For: METHOD OF MANUFACTURING A

SEMICONDUCTOR DEVICE

) Group Art Unit: 2818

) Examiner: D. Le

) CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

) I hereby certify that this correspondence is
) being deposited with the United States Postal
) Service with sufficient postage as First Class
) Mail in an envelope addressed to:
) Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450,
) Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on March 1,
) 2004.

Adeline M. Stanger

RESPONSE

Honorable Commissioner of Patents

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

The Official Action mailed December 1, 2003, has been received and its contents carefully noted. This response is filed within three months of the mailing date of the Official Action and therefore is believed to be timely without extension of time. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that this response is being timely filed.

The Applicants note with appreciation the consideration of the Information Disclosure Statements filed on February 14, 2002 (received by OIPE on April 5, 2002), December 20, 2002, and January 31, 2003. However, the Applicants have not received acknowledgment of the IDS filed on February 14, 2002 (received by OIPE on the same date). The Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner provide an initialed copy of the Form PTO-1449 evidencing consideration of the Information Disclosure Statement noted above. A further Notice of Related Application is submitted herewith and consideration of this Notice of Related Application is respectfully requested.

Claims 107-179 are pending in the present application, of which claims 107, 126, 142 and 161 are independent. For the reasons set forth in detail below, all claims are believed to be in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

The Official Action rejects claims 107-179 under the doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting over claim 1 (or claim 10) of co-pending U.S. Application No.




10/072,931 to Yamazaki et al. As stated in MPEP § 804, under the heading "Obviousness-Type," in order to form an obviousness-type double patenting rejection, a claim in the present application must define an invention that is merely an obvious variation of an invention claimed in the prior art patent, and the claimed subject matter must not be patentably distinct from the subject matter claimed in a commonly owned patent. Also, the patent principally underlying the double patenting rejection is not considered prior art.

The Applicants respectfully traverse the obviousness-type double patenting rejection because independent claims 107, 126, 142 and 161 of the present invention are patentably distinct from the claims of Yamazaki '931. Specifically, claims 107, 142, and 161 recite forming a third semiconductor film containing one conductive type impurity element on the second semiconductor film, and claim 126 recites adding one conductive type impurity element to only an upper layer of the second semiconductor film. The claims of Yamazaki '931 do not teach or suggest a one conductive type impurity element. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully submit that the subject application is patentably distinct from the claims of the Yamazaki '931 patent. Reconsideration of the obviousness-type double patenting rejection is requested.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable to place this application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



Eric J. Robinson
Reg. No. 38,285

Robinson Intellectual Property Law Office, P.C.
PMB 955
21010 Southbank Street
Potomac Falls, Virginia 20165
(571) 434-6789